



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Syria as early as the time of Alexander. The various utopias which classic authors located in India or Ethiopia prove nothing about specifically Buddhistic communities in those regions, and the so-called oriental speculation which influenced Greek and early Christian thinkers is Brahminic rather than Buddhistic. Pantheistic emanationism has always been at home in Asia; but it is a mistake to ascribe its spread to the preaching of Buddhism. The problem which needs solution is not how the New Testament writers were influenced by this type of thought, but how they kept so thoroughly free from it.

As to specific Buddhistic influence, the work before us proves no more than that some sort of connection exists between the stories of the nativity and of the temptation and similar accounts in Buddhist documents.

By the way, it was new to me that modern scholars are gradually accepting the view that *Pharisee* is only *Parsi* writ large.

NEW YORK CITY

HENRY PRESERVED SMITH

THE BROSS PRIZE

A peculiar interest attaches to Dr. Orr's book¹ as being the first-fruits of the Bross prizes. Does it contain the guarantee of a usefulness commensurate with the dignity it possesses as the winner of so generous a prize in a competition thrown open to the scholars of all nations?

The temper of the book is admirable. Dr. Orr is no obscurantist. In dealing with the problem of the Old Testament he does not press the authority of Christ's testimony as if that closed the debate (p. 523). He does not argue on the basis of an inerrancy theory of inspiration (pp. 49, 363). He admits that the Old Testament books and the Old Testament religion must be studied as other books and other religions are studied (pp. 9, 14). He pays a fairly generous tribute to the great value of the critical work of the past century (p. 9), especially in its interpretation of prophecy (p. 453). He trusts to the self-corrective power of reverent science finally to solve "The Problem" (p. 15). In these respects Dr. Orr adopts a common standing-ground with the scholars from whom he differs. Therefore argument with him is possible. It may be thought that in the opening chapter he raises, in an unwarranted fashion, a dogmatic presumption against the critical position, when he emphasizes the fact that the chief exponents of criticism have been thoroughgoing anti-supernaturalists, and suggests that there is, "on the face of it, a supreme improbability that a theory evolved under the conditions . . . described

¹ *The Problem of the Old Testament : Considered with Reference to Recent Criticism*. By James Orr. New York: Scribner, 1906. 562 pages. \$1.75.

should be, in that form, adequate to Christian faith" (p. 17); i. e., to a faith in a revelation which culminates in Christ (p. 22). To "go it blind" in the search for truth, as a good many popularizers of critical results seem inclined to do, is not the surest way to find truth, at least in the religious sphere. And yet, when "the majority of scholars of all classes, in churches and out of churches, High Church, Broad Church, and Low Church, skeptical and believing," have substantially adopted the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis (p. 17), this not only witnesses to the "plausibility of the theory," as Dr. Orr admits, but suggests that the traditional interpretation of the Old Testament must really leave the problem of the Old Testament unsolved. Otherwise how account for this remarkable communion of light with darkness?

Dr. Orr's disposition of his material appears to be excellent. In what is really the first part of the book he adopts, provisionally, the usual analysis of the Hexateuch, and on the basis of this argues against the historical inferences of the critics (chaps 2-6). He then proceeds to a criticism of the analysis itself and the dating of the various codes (chaps 7-10). This order of discussion has the double advantage of preserving as long as possible a common critical standing-ground with his opponents, and of keeping the great historical issues as free as possible from the complications and technicalities of the critical analysis. In chap. 11 the recent archaeological discoveries are utilized to support the conclusions of the preceding discussion as to the essential historicity of the Old Testament. The last chapter on the Psalter, the reality of predictive prophecy, and the progressiveness of revelation is more in the nature of an appendix than a necessary link in the general argument of the book.

We think it is safe to say that nowhere will the student find in so compact a form an abler arraignment of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis, which is Dr. Orr's immediate object of attack, than in the present work. Deserving of special notice is the way in which the critical admission that JE is pre-prophetic is made use of to assign a much higher antiquity and consequent trustworthiness to these documents than is commonly accorded to them. If these documents are as monotheistic as the critics admit, and if at the same time they are pre-prophetic, then ethical monotheism is not the discovery of the writing prophets, but must have arisen much earlier. Again, if JE represents a north-Israelitic and a Jewish tradition which are substantially parallel, this means that the patriarchal and Mosaic tradition was certainly fixed before the division of the kingdom, and it can be dated back to a much more remote antiquity without violating any objective historical probability, but only the prepossessions of the Wellhausen school.

By this line of argument Dr. Orr seeks to vindicate a highly developed religion in the time of Moses and a substantial historicity for the patriarchal narratives. Again, the disagreements of the critics among themselves are very skilfully employed to discredit the whole critical position. This argument is especially relied upon in the discussion of the date of P. Here Dr. Orr urges the arguments of the Dillmann - Kittel - Baudissin school to prove the existence of a large amount of P material in pre-exilic times (pp. 313 ff.), and then presses the contention of Wellhausen, that if P is not post-exilic, it may as well be substantially Mosaic (pp. 326 ff.).

It is at this point that one of the chief criticisms of Dr. Orr's book may be made. While obtaining a very clear insight into the difficulties of the critical position, especially in the Graf-Wellhausen formulation of it, the uninitiated reader would really gain very little idea from this work of the seriousness of the problem of the Old Testament. Such a reader, especially if he be temperamentally opposed to the removal of the ancient landmarks, would probably lay down Dr. Orr's book with the easeful conviction that all the armies of the aliens had been disastrously routed. The book is indeed so "plausible," to use the word which Dr. Orr applies to the Wellhausen hypothesis, that we fear it will serve as "poppy and mandragora" to many persons who will not take the time to examine exhaustively the biblical data, and lull them to sleep in a false security as to the tenableness of the ancient tradition. In all critical work it is the cumulative argument which is used with the most telling effect. Dr. Orr is able at best to refer only to a few exegetical difficulties urged by critics against the traditional views. But difficulties that may be successfully treated when kept in quarantine often prove fatal when exposed to the fresh contagion of contexts. The cumulative force of the exegetical data underlying the critical position is largely ignored by Dr. Orr. A striking instance of this is the omission of any real discussion of the problem suggested by the relation of the sources preserved in Kings to the redactor's framework, and the relationship of the book of Kings as a whole to Chronicles—one of the strongest indirect arguments in favor of the Wellhausen hypothesis. This leads to the second criticism which we think may fairly be passed upon the work of Dr. Orr. Able as it undoubtedly is (we will admit its ability and not merely its plausibility), one cannot avoid the feeling that Dr. Orr is more successful in pointing out the weak spots in the critical position than in his own exegesis of the biblical data. For example, he distinguishes the priests and Levites in Deut. 18:1 and 6 (pp. 187, 191); Exod. 33:7 only implies that Moses pitched the tabernacle "in particular

circumstances" without the camp (p. 168); the "house of God" in Judges and Samuel is identified with the tent of meeting (p. 172); "There are no good grounds for disputing the genuineness of Exod. 15" (p. 100; cf. 265. Has Dr. Orr really studied the tense sequence in this passage?); "The festal tithe of Deuteronomy is different from, and additional to, the ordinary tithe for the maintenance of the Levites" (p. 275); the phrase "beyond Jordan" as used in Deuteronomy does not necessarily imply a west-Jordan standpoint (!) (pp. 281 ff.); the fourth empire in Daniel is the Roman (pp. 536 ff.)! These illustrations, which are all taken from crucial points in the debate, suggest the question whether Dr. Orr's position would not ultimately compel a return to the old harmonistic method of interpreting Scripture, and whether this reversion is at all probable? Scientific exegesis raised the problem of the Old Testament. The study of comparative religions has accentuated it. Dr. Orr's exegesis does not inspire confidence, and he shows little sympathy with the attempt to observe the biblical phenomena in the atmosphere created by the latter study. The above considerations compel us to share in the doubt of the author when he confesses that he "entertains no oversanguine expectation as to its [the book's] effect on general conviction;" but we would also share in his "hope that it may at least rouse to reflection some who have given too easy an assent to current theories" (p. xvii). As a critique of present criticism it certainly challenges a respectful and a studied reply.

The notes on pp. 362-77 do not agree in their sequence with those on pp. 522-27.

KEMPER FULLERTON

OBERLIN, OHIO

SOME COMMENTARIES ON THE PROPHETS

Commentaries on prophetic books of the Old Testament representing three distinct types lie before us. Professor von Orelli¹ is a representative of the older school of exegetes of the class of Delitzsch—those who have ever been open-minded, and scholarly, eminent in learning, and yet not profoundly original. Thus in the volumes of von Orelli we find evinced sound historical and grammatical exegesis, and a full knowledge of the literature of his subject; and yet a failure to fall into line with some

¹ *Der Prophet Jesaja*. Ausgelegt von C. von Orelli. Dritte, neu durchgearbeitete Auflage. München: Beck, 1904. vi + 228 pages. M. 3.50.

Der Prophet Jeremia. Übersetzt und ausgelegt von C. von Orelli. Dritte, neu durchgearbeitete Auflage. München: Beck, 1905. vi + 216 pages. M. 3.50.

(Both of these volumes belong to Strack & Zöckler's *Kurzgefasster Kommentar zu den Heiligen Schriften des Alten und Neuen Testaments*.)